

Unique IDentification (UID)

GFP Industry Group Meeting November 29-30, 2004

1662 Breakout



1662 Discussion

Data Elements needed for UID Registration Population?

- Do we need 1662 as well for 2005?
 - Yes
- Do we continue 1662's for non-UID items?
 - Something like the 1662, but not the 1662
- What do to with Real Property
 - Brainstorm a plan of action
 - Report it like the non-UID items
- What to do about audits/verification
 - Next slide



Audits/Verification/Reconciliatio

- Cpmponents of 1662 (Existing)
 - RP, ST, APP, STE, IPE/OPE, Material, Contractor Acquired items, Government Furnished items
- Future System
 - RP (GO)
 - Equipment (GF)
 - Material (GF)
 - Raw Materials
 - LVP
 - CAP

Each

Step 1: Create '05 1662 with audit trail from '04 (i.e., our normal process)

Step 2: Transition '05 (1662) data to new categories

Step 3: Post - Reconciliation

- 1. Depreciate values of UID items
- 2. Annual report of non-UID items (lump sum)
- 3. Eliminate CAP reporting

Guidance out by March!



1662 to Future (Online?) Continued

- Handling of Low Risk Property (LRP)
 - Net Book Value is Zero (items have been expensed)
 - Accountability by contractors drives an "Inventory" value
 - Depreciates over time
- What is the timeline (How do we do this)
 - Need guidance by end of March
 - Need special format (September 30, 2005) that matches 1662 to future (online?) system to segue (onetime only)
 - Need format for LRP for beyond 2005



LOW RISK PROPERTY (LRP)

- Deviation < \$5k (that is not UID)
- FAR RW Risk Based
 - Everything that has a UID
- ◆ UID >= \$5k
- Capitalized at \$100K



1662 Discussion

- Brainstorm approach to interim DFARS coverage to get better traceability between spares & equipment
 - DoDI 5000.64 sets property management floor at \$5k
 - UID floor is \$5k plus identified additions
 - FAR rewrite moves to risk based property management versus dollar threshold
 - Should we review/change DFARS to remove the \$5k floor and put it in other guidance



1662 Discussion

- How can we ensure "1662-like" future reporting excludes CAP?
 - DOD needs to adopt the "Possession" concept
 - Upon "possession" CAP would be treated similarly to end items.